UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/606,503	06/26/2003	Jeyhan Karaoguz	14046US02	5221
	7590 04/28/200 S HELD & MALLOY,	EXAMINER		
500 WEST MA	DISON STREET	WONG, BLANCHE		
SUITE 3400 CHICAGO, IL 60661			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2419	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/28/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/606,503	KARAOGUZ ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Blanche Wong	2419		

	Bianche Worlg	2419	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>27 March 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidaveal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig	of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on . A brief in compl	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor	•	TE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	parraepanding number of finally rei	acted claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reju	scied ciaims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non Co	mpliant Amondment (DTOL 324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpliant Amendment (F 10L-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		timaly filed amondmor	at cancoling the
non-allowable claim(s).	owable ii subifilited iii a separate,	uniely filed afficilatile	it canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. 🔲 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.		n condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	F10/36/06) Paper No(s)		
/Edan Orgad/	/Blanche Wong/		
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2419	Examiner, Art Unit 2419		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With regard to claim 1, Applicant states that "Garces does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of 'receiving a response from said at least one of a plurality of access points, said response reporting a presence of at least one access device located within a coverage area of said at least one of a plurality of access points" Remark, p.11, para. 2. Applicant also states that "the synch response 216 does not reporting back to the remote device K1 110 a presence of at least one access device located within a coverage area of the WAP device L1 130. Remark, p.12, para. 1. Examiner has shown at least one form of reporting back using the sync response and at least one presence of access device, namely WAP device. If Applicant is arguing a form/type of reporting back or more than one presence of access device, such a limitation is not found in the claims. Therefore, rejections maintain. Response to Arguments: Applicant states that "[t]he issue here is whether or not the sync response contains information and is reporting a presence of an access device that is located within the coverage area of the WAP device L1 130. Remark, p.9, para. 1. Examiner has shown at least one form of reporting back using the sync response and at least one presence of access device, namely WAP device. Again, if Applicant is arguing "reporting back" is e.g. a message contains information, such a limitation is not found in the claim. If Applicant is arguing the presence of another access device, other than the access device that is performing the method of claim 1 (including broadcasting, receiving, and requesting), such a limitation is not found in the claim.

By having the WAP device responds to the remote device, it is inherent that the presence of the WAP device is known to the remote device. The claim language does not differentiate between different WAP devices and their presence but rather limits it to only one device and therefore only one response is necessary to equate "presence".

As Applicant points out, "claims 7,13,19,23 are similar in many respects to the method disclosed in independent claim 1." Remark, p.12, para. 3. Please see comments for claim 1.

Claims 2-6, 8-12,14-18,20-22,24-25 depend from independent claims 1,7,13,19,23.